

1910

A Methodist Tract On Baptism Reviewed

Ira C. Moore

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), [Comparative Methodologies and Theories Commons](#), [Practical Theology Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Moore, Ira C., "A Methodist Tract On Baptism Reviewed" (1910). *Stone-Campbell Books*. Book 116.
http://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books/116

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Stone-Campbell Resources at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Stone-Campbell Books by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU. For more information, please contact dc@acu.edu.

A Methodist Tract On Baptism Reviewed

BY IRA C. MOORE

Humanity, governed by prejudice, cuts some mighty queer "capers" to carry a point. He who sincerely declares that "it makes no difference what order is observed in the Lord's day worship" relative to "the Apostles' teaching and fellowship, the breaking of the loaf and the prayers" of Acts 2: 42, should not raise trouble with any congregation if they observe them in the order named. He who teaches that immersion is baptism, as well as pouring and sprinkling, should not object to nor argue with one who prefers to be immersed, nor write tracts against immersion. "Thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal?" Consistency is an admirable quality in any one, but it is a jewel rare.

There comes to me from a distant State a letter bringing a tract by the "Publishing House, M. E. Church, South, Nashville, Tenn.," bearing the significant title: "Baptism As Jesus Understood It," having T. L. Hulse for its author. I am asked urgently to "review" it through the Leader.

The author starts out with a true statement that "Jesus and his disciples were Jews and were well acquainted with Jewish customs and laws. They would naturally understand the customs of their people as those of their day understood them and as their writers interpreted them in their current literature." There would be no chance for criticism or "review" of the tract had its author "understood the laws and customs of the Jews" as well as they did and truthfully given them. But alas! in the very first "dash out of the box" he gets egregiously wrong by assuming that all purifyings under the law of Moses were accomplished by sprinkling, and that Paul in Hebrews 9: 10 and other references in the New Testament refers to those sprinklings and calls them "baptisms." Thus he makes out his case—a pretty slick kind of sophism that will catch the uninformed and the unwary, especially if the New Testament description of baptism is not known or well remembered. It is inexcusable

of any pretended Biblical scholar to say that the baptisms mentioned by Paul in Hebrews 6: 1, 2 and 9: 10 refer to the sprinklings under the law. These scriptures read: "Wherefore leaving the doctrine of the first principles of Christ, let us press on unto perfection; not laying again a foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, of the teaching of baptisms (Margin, "washings"), and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment"; and, "being only (with meats and drinks and divers washings) carnal ordinances, imposed until a time of reformation." The contention of sprinklers is that "baptisms" and "washings" as here used by Paul allude to the sprinklings of the law.

We can lay it down as an indisputable fact that God never commanded that the element water and it alone be sprinkled upon any person for any purpose whatever, ceremonial or religious. The very meaning of the word from which we have "baptize" and "baptism" in the N. T. positively forbids that either of them should be used to refer to the sprinklings under the law. The Hebrews and Greeks had words for sprinkle and pour, as well as for immerse, and often in the Old Testament all three of them are used in the same verse; and it is unaccountable how any honest man can get the consent of his mind to make the one for "baptize" and "baptism" refer to the others when there are numerous uses of its own kind and family to refer to. In Leviticus it is directed a number of times that "the priest shall dip (baphei) his finger in the blood, and sprinkle (prosranei) of the blood seven times before Jehovah,—
and all the blood of the bullock shall he pour (ekcheei) out at the base of the altar." These are from bapto, raino and cheo, respectively, and mean "dip" or "immerse," "sprinkle," and "pour," just as each is given in our English versions. If there had been nothing practiced for cleansing and purifying of the flesh but sprinkling, and the Holy Spirit in the

Apostles when writing the things now in the New Testament, had referred to those cleansings and purifyings as "baptisms," the tract author's conclusion would follow with absolute certainty that sprinkling some fluid on one is baptism. But while there were about twenty sprinklings under the law, there were eighteen bathings, washings, immersings, and these are always described by the words "louo" or some form of "bapto," never by any form of "raino" (sprinkle) or "cheo" (pour). The acts represented by these words are so distinct and different from each other that the use of one of them **excludes** the others. Never can one of them **include** either of the others.

Our author very seriously misrepresents the Jewish historian, Josephus. He says: "Josephus was one of the most noted Jewish historians. He was well acquainted with the customs of his people and understood the Greek language as it was used in the days of Christ and his apostles." To this we can all agree. Then he quotes Josephus as saying, when "referring to the custom of cleansing from a dead body," "Baptizing (baptizontes) by this ashes put into spring water, they sprinkle on the third and seventh day." Antiquities of the Jews, Book 4, chapter 4 is given as the place where this occurs. Here is what we find there: "When therefore any persons were defiled by a dead body, they put a little of these ashes (ashes made from the burning of the red heifer with cedar wood and hyssop and scarlet wool as described in Numbers 19th) into spring water, with hyssop, and, dipping (baptizontes) part of these ashes in it, they sprinkled them with it, both on the third day, and on the seventh day, and after that they were clean. This he enjoined them to do also when the tribes should come into their own land."

What shall we think of a professed Christian and leader of the people who will thus mutilate an author's words to sustain a human practice and a human church institution? There is no continuity of thought and no sense in the quotation as given by the tract author. As Josephus "was well acquainted with the customs of his people" and with the law of cleansing as given by Moses, the cor-

rect quotation from him puts him in perfect agreement with that law of cleansing, while Hulse's garbled quotation is not respectable nonsense. It is sad enough for a "guide" to go "into the pit" alone; but surely it will be many times worse for him to go there and be sensible of the fact that he is responsible for the presence of many others with him.

Here is the way Mr. Hulse handles the law for cleansing in Numbers 19: 16-19: "And whosoever toucheth . . . a dead body . . . shall be unclean seven days. And for an unclean person they shall take of the ashes of the burnt heifer of purification for sin, and running water shall be put thereto in a vessel; and a (ceremonially) clean person shall take hyssop, and dip it in the water, and sprinkle it . . . upon him that touched . . . one dead." Then adds: "Every Jew knew of this custom of cleansing from physical defilement. Did any Jewish writer ever refer to it as baptism?"

Here is what he should have continued with: "And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean on the third day, and on the seventh day; and on the seventh day he shall purify him; and he shall wash his clothes and bathe himself in water, and shall be clean at even." The one unclean from touching a grave or some dead person or a bone, in addition to having the "water of purifying" sprinkled upon him, was to "wash his clothes and bathe himself and be unclean until the even," before he was cleansed or purified. This washing and "bathing" was not the same as the "sprinkling"; but it is the washings and bathings that Paul refers to in Hebrews 6: 1, 2 and 9: 10, not to the sprinklings. The same Holy Spirit that guided the lawmakers, prophets and poets of the Old Testament in what they spoke and wrote, also guided the Apostles of the New in their utterances, (II Pet. 1: 20, 21); and it would be a mark of forgetfulness, incompetency, unreasonableness and inconsistency, to say the last of it, on the part of that supposed omniscient Spirit, for him to have so thoroughly established the "washings" and "bathings" of the law as the acts described by the words "louo" and "baptizo," and then when influencing the writers of the New

Testament, prompted them to refer to sprinkling by the use of the same words he once used to mean laving, washing, bathing and immersing. So we answer the author's question if "any Jewish writer ever refer to it (sprinkling) as baptism" by giving an emphatic NO. This takes the foundation from under Mr. Hulse's fabric; but we shall devote more articles to a review and expose of his sophistry and self-deception.

* * * * *

A Methodist Tract On Baptism Reviewed Article II

An act is given its character by the faith and purpose the actor has in performing the deed. The act of eating a common meal is the same as eating the Lord's Supper; but between them is the wide difference there is between satisfying a fleshly appetite and obeying a Divine command, and this difference in character is made by the difference in the purpose accompanying each. When in swimming and diving from a spring board into ten feet or more of water and touching the bottom, one is completely immersed; but what church would admit that one into its folds as "a member in good standing" on the grounds of that dive and immersion? It would lack the character which an acknowledged and expressed faith in Christ and a full purpose of heart to be "baptized unto the remission of sins," or to "wash away his sins," would give to the solemn "burial with the Lord in baptism." The difference in the character of the two would be just as great as the difference in faith and purpose would be, the same difference there is between an act of sport, and a sincere act of obedience to the Lord.

Even though we should grant (though we by no means do) that, as Mr. Hulse says, the sprinklings of blood and water under the law of Moses are referred to by Paul as baptisms, there is an immeasurable difference between such sprinklings and Methodist sprinklings, both in WHAT was sprinkled and the PURPOSE for which the sprinkling was done. Never was just water and that alone sprinkled on any one by the authority of Jehovah for any purpose whatever—it was always water mixed with ashes and blood; but Methodists sprinkle pure water—water

unmixed with blood, ashes or anything else. And the law sprinklings were a step toward cleansing and purifying the person or object upon which the mixture was sprinkled; while the Methodists vow and declare that the one upon whom water alone is sprinkled (except in the case of the innocent and helpless infant) is ALREADY CLEAN AND PURE. While the acts performed therefore may be the same, they differ in purpose as wide as the expanse of the heavens. This difference makes it impossible for the Methodist sprinklings to have the same character as the sprinklings of the law and be "baptisms," even if the sprinklings under the law should be referred to as "baptisms." But to thus refer to them we would have to overlook and disregard the wide difference in meaning between baptizo (immerse), cheo (pour), and raino (sprinkle). It is an absolute certainty that the Divine writers did not overlook and disregard that difference. They were too consistent to speak of sprinklings as immersions. So the author of the tract states the antipode of truth when he says, "In the days of Christ this custom of cleansing by sprinkling was referred to as baptism."

He next tries his hand on drawing an argument in favor of sprinkling from what Mark and Luke record about the bathing before eating, and the washing of cups and pots, etc., (Lk. 11: 37, 38; Mk. 7: 3, 4). Luke tells of a Pharisee that invited Jesus to dine with him who "marvelled that He did not first wash (baptize) before dinner"; and Mark says, "For the Pharisee and all the Jews, except they wash their hands diligently, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders: and when they come from the market place, except they bathe (baptize) themselves, they eat not." The author rather leaves the reader to conclude that these washings or bathings are sprinklings. He says: "One of the duties of servants in that day was to provide water and sprinkle it on the hands of master and guests on such occasions. Elisha was the servant of Elijah and performed this service for him," and quotes: "Here is Elisha, . . . which poured water on the hands of Elijah," (II Ki. 3: 11).

Cups, pots, brazen vessels, etc., are not cleansed by sprinkling a little water on them—they are bathed, immersed; and there is no reason to think that the “bathings” and “washings” mentioned in the references given was anything else than these words signify in their established meanings. Their beds or couches which they immersed were not big straw or feather ticks or mattresses, such as are commonly known now as beds; but were only blankets or robes which they could well carry when told to “arise, take up thy bed and go to thy house,” (Matt. 9: 6). In all ceremonial cleansings there was first the sprinkling of the “cleansing mixture of blood, water and ashes, followed by the bathing, immersing, acts that were entirely different and distinct; and as the sprinklings were never called the bathings or washings, it is therefore NOT these that the N. Testament writers refer to as the “washings” or “baptisms.”

The statement about Elisha “pouring water on the hands of Elijah” is an Eastern way of saying that he was Elijah’s constant and faithful attendant or servant, and is not an illustration of how the hands were baptized. Our author says: “One of the duties of servants in that day was to provide water and **sprinkle** it on the hands of master and guests on such occasions,” and then refers to this case of Elisha **POURING** water on the hands of Elijah as an illustration of the “custom of **SPRINKLING**”! Are pouring and sprinkling synonyms? Is it sensible and accurate speech to call a “pouring” a “sprinkling”; or a “sprinkling” a “pouring”? Truth does not have to resort to such sophistical and crooked tactics in its defense as this author has resorted to.

Concerning pouring water on the hands, Mr. Hulse says: “This custom was so universal among the Jews of that day that special preparation was made for its observance in the homes.” Then this rules sprinkling out, for pouring was not sprinkling. He continues: “Hence, when Jesus discovered a lack of wine at the wedding feast at Cana, he found there “six water pots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews,” (Jno. 2: 6). From these larger vessels the servants took water and poured on the hands of master and guests, and also on the

furniture, as a ceremonial purification, and Mark and Luke call this custom baptism.”

The “criss crossing” from washing, bathing, immersing and “pouring” in this to sprinkling is easily seen. Again we say with emphasis that never for any purpose did the Lord Jehovah require the Jews at any time to sprinkle water alone and water only upon any one or anything. And how does evidence in favor of **pouring** water for any purpose prove sprinkling to be “the mode of baptism”? Pouring water on one is not sprinkling it. What a “strong delusion” Mr. Hulse is under! Mark and Luke DO NOT “call this custom (pouring water on hands and furniture) baptism.” They call the bathing, immersing and washings “baptizing,” (Mk. 7: 4).

Our author now reverts to Paul’s language in Heb. 9: 10—“which stood only in meats and drinks and divers washings (baptisms)” —and remarks: “Note here that an apostle, a Jew, a Christian, writing in the current universal Greek to his people in all lands, called these ancient cleansings “baptisms.” He knew every Jew, every Christian, every Greek would so call them, did so call them. Appeals to the earlier classical Greek do not settle the case.” (That is a virtual admission that the earlier classical Greek is against his position that “baptisms” refers to and means the “sprinklings and pourings” of the law.—I. C. M.) The case is settled by the meaning of the word as it was used and understood by those who lived in that age; and Jesus used and understood the word as those of his day used and understood it. That the author of Hebrews refers to the custom of cleansing from a dead body as one of the ‘divers baptisms’ is seen in verses 13, 14: “For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer **sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh**: how much more shall the blood of Christ . . . purge (cleanse) your hearts?”

I have exposed this “wresting of the Scripture” in Article I, but will further expose it in this. No three actions can differ from each other more than sprinkling, pouring and dipping. When we sprinkle an individual we put something

upon him; and when we dip him, we put him INTO a liquid. This is clearly illustrated by the law in Leviticus 14: 15, 16 for the cleansing of the leper. "And the priest shall take of the log of oil, and POUR it into the palm of his own left hand; and the priest shall DIP his right finger in the oil that is in his left hand, and shall SPRINKLE of the oil with his finger seven times before Jehovah." Not even a Methodist preacher, had he been the officiating priest under this law, would have made the mistake of dipping the oil into the palm of his left hand, and of sprinkling his right finger in the oil, and pouring of the oil seven times before Jehovah! The way was prepared for this cleansing thus: "As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar-wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall DIP them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water: and he shall SPRINKLE upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean, and shall let go the living bird into the open field. And he that is to be cleansed shall WASH his clothes, and shave off his hair, and BATHE himself in water; and he shall be clean; and after that he shall come into the camp. And it shall be on the seventh day that he shall shave all his hair off his head and his beard and his eyebrows, even all his hair he shall shave off; and he shall WASH his clothes, and he shall BATHE his flesh in water, and he shall be clean."

Now with such plain cases of washing and bathing the flesh, it is astonishing how any honest searcher after truth can think that Paul referred to the sprinklings and pourings, instead of the bathings and washings only, by a word that means bathing and washing, and does not mean sprinkle and pour. Suppose that to dip, bathe or wash an individual in water was an indictable offense, and that Mr. Hulse was haled into court under an indictment for dipping or washing some one; and suppose that it should appear at the trial by the evidence that he only poured or sprinkled a little water on the person, would he not be acquitted of dipping, bathing or washing him, and discharged? Thus we acquit Paul of being

so inaccurate in speech and so densely ignorant of the Jewish law that he referred to the sprinklings and pourings under the law when he speaks of "divers washings" for the cleansing of the flesh.

A Methodist Tract On Baptism Reviewed Article III.

Surely it is grossly inconsistent for a man to contend for sprinkling and pouring of water as the means of soul-cleansing in baptism when the church theory of that one is that the sinner must be cleansed, pardoned, saved, forgiven BEFORE and without either sprinkling, pouring or dipping.

In the next argument Mr. Hulse makes we have another example of "handling the word of the Lord deceitfully." He says: "Turn to John 3: 25, 26: 'there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying.' What provoked the discussion? Evidently the fact that both John and Jesus were baptizing. The Jews understood it to be some kind of ceremonial purification and came to John's disciples for an explanation. They then carried it to John for a solution, saying, 'He that was with thee beyond Jordan . . . baptizeth, and all men come to him.' This incident is valuable in this discussion because it shows that to the Jew the act of baptism always suggested the idea of ceremonial purification. To the Jews of Christ's day the terms were synonymous."

Hulse means that "baptizing" and "purifying" "are terms synonymous." He is unable or unwilling to distinguish between an ACT and the consequences of that act. Since shooting a man through the heart kills him, therefore every killing is a shooting through the heart, according to Hulse's logic. Since the sprinklings, washings, bathings, dipping under the law were to result in purifying ceremonially and carnally, therefore every purifying is a sprinkling! Wonderful logic! Since the law and Paul tell us that it was "the ashes of an heifer and the blood of bulls and goats that was sprinkled upon the unclean to purify the flesh," (Heb. 9: 13, 14), we are led to wonder if there would have been any disputation over purifying if the disciples of John and the Jews had observed John

and Jesus dipping up a little water from the Jordan and sprinkling it upon the people. They would all have **known** such a performance was not for purifying according to anything in the law of Moses. If it was the baptizing they witnessed that "provoked the discussion," it proves beyond a respectable quibble that baptizing was NOT sprinkling or pouring, but was after the manner of the bathings, washings and dippings of the law. "Washing his clothes and bathing himself in water" was the last act in the cleansing process for the Leper, and for the one who had touched an unclean thing or dead body. But water alone was NEVER used to sprinkle on any one in the process of cleansing or purifying, and all Jews and John's disciples knew it.

After laying down these false premises, Mr. Hulse continues: "With this idea of ceremonial purification, Jesus came to his own baptism. When John hesitated to administer the rite, Jesus urged the demands of the law, saying: 'Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness.' What were some of the demands of the law? (1) The priest must be thirty years old before he could enter upon the functions of his office, (Num. 4: 47). (2) The priest must be inducted into his office by the well-known rite of ceremonial purification, (Num. 8: 6, 7). How was this done? 'Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and **cleanse them**. And thus shalt thou do unto them, to cleanse them: **Sprinkle water of purifying upon them;**" Jesus came to his baptism at the age of thirty, (Luke 3: 23). He came not to be made a priest, but to be clothed with the authority of a priest in the Jewish Church. He waited until he was thirty because the law required that he should wait. Having met this demand of the law, he seeks to meet the other one by having a priest 'sprinkle the water of purifying upon him'."

Isn't this a "Duke's Mixture"? It is a puzzle how people can read the Bible with a view to ascertaining the facts and truths contained in it, and get things so badly wrong as this. Here we have enough to occupy our efforts through the rest of this article.

First, John and Jesus were NOT obeying any requirement of the law of Moses. Jesus had not violated any part of the law of Moses, making it necessary that He be "cleansed" or "purified"; nor was He in any way "defiled," making ceremonial cleansing necessary. John was not, in baptizing in the Jordan, complying with any part of the law of Moses. He had a special commission from God. "There came a man, sent from God, whose name was John," (Jno. 1: 6). And in verse 33 John is reported as saying: "And I knew him not; but he that sent me to baptize in water, he said unto me, Upon whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and abiding upon him, etc." If John was but complying with an ordinance of the law of Moses, how did it occur that so many of the Jews, even John himself and Christ, had not been baptized long, long before?

Second, while the priest had to be thirty years old, and had to be "inducted into his office by the well-known rite of ceremonial purification," to be baptized out in an open stream was NO PART of that "ceremony." Let him who thinks it was, go on a search for the Divine instructions. The law for separating the Levites to the priesthood reads: "Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them. And thus shalt thou do unto them, to cleanse them; sprinkle the water of expiation upon them, (That was the 'blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of a heifer' described in Numbers 19th and referred to by Paul in Heb. 9: 13, 14), and let them cause a razor to pass over all their flesh (Nothing of this kind was done in Jesus' case), and let them wash their clothes, and cleanse themselves." This cleansing of themselves is described as "bathing themselves in water," (Lev. 14: 8, 9.) If our tract author has not handled the word of God deceitfully, it would be very difficult to find a case of deception.

Third, Jesus was not of the priestly tribe and therefore could not be "clothed with the authority of a priest under a law." Just how any one of the priestly tribe could be "clothed with the authority of a priest" and not function as a priest, does not appear. The law imposed the

penalty of death upon any one not of the tribe of Levi who would "come near to burn incense before Jehovah," (Num. 16: 40). Korah and his presumptuous company are noted examples of such usurpers and their end. See all the 16th chapter of Numbers. Paul says (Heb. 8: 4) that if Jesus "were on earth he would not be a priest at all, seeing that there are priests that offer the sacrifices according to the law." The reason is that Jesus was "of the tribe of Judah: of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood," (Heb. 7: 13, 14). Our author asks: "Is there any other evidence that Jesus was inducted into the priestly office by John's baptism?" And this just after saying that Jesus "came not to be made a priest"! Now he declares interrogatively that He "was inducted into the priestly office by John's baptism"! Did it make priests out of all that came to John and were baptized? Error makes a crooked path. In consecrating one to the priest's office, it required seven days and the offering of rams and bullocks on each of the seven days. Was such ceremonies attended to in the case of Jesus out by the Jordan river? For proof that Jesus was inducted into the priest's office by John's baptism, our befuddled author says: "When he cleansed the temple by driving out the money changers he was exercising the authority of a priest. The indignant Jews came to him asking: 'By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority?' In reply Jesus calmly cited them to John's baptism. 'Was it from heaven, or of men?' It is clear that he meant to say: 'When I received baptism at the hands of John I was invested with all the authority of a priest in the Jewish Church.'"

Isn't that profound? The only trouble with it is that it is not so. A reading of the account as given in Matthew 21: 23-27 will expose the folly of this. The wonderful miracles He had just been performing should have prevented the chief priests and elders from asking Him whence His authority. His miracle-working power was ample answer to their question, and His question to them put them into such a corner that to answer it convicted them of rejecting and re-

belling against the authority of God who sent John to baptize. Such shallow thinkers as Hulse whose effort is only to quibble in an effort to escape obedience to a plain command from the Lord, is close kin to the work of these chief priests and elders who questioned Jesus' authority after seeing His mighty miracles. In our next installment we shall deal with the tract's teaching on the Holy Spirit baptism.

A Methodist Tract On Baptism Reviewed

Article IV

The author of the tract under review started out to prove that sprinkling a little water on the head or face of a person is baptism. While admitting that immersion is baptism, he wandered around on words that mean immerse and pour to prove that Christ and the Apostles did neither mean nor practice immersion for baptism. It seems that when he makes ones statement he cannot see when he runs afoul of it in others. As next to his final stand to save his fragile cause, he now resorts to trying to show that "the real purifying baptism" is the "baptism with the Holy Ghost," and that "baptism with water is significant as a sign of the purifying work of the Holy Ghost."

We are wondering which meaning of "baptism" he gives to the word when he speaks of "the Holy Ghost baptism." Does he mean that that baptism is only a **sprinkling** of the Spirit or Ghost, and that as little of that Ghost is used as the Methodists use of water? If so, that accounts for their possession of so little of the Spirit of Christianity and so much of the spirit of the world. Viewed from the effects upon them of their so-called "baptism with the Holy Ghost," we must give them some credit for furnishing proof that "baptism," as applied to the "baptism with the Holy Spirit," means only a sprinkling! But here, according to my acquaintance with their claims as to that baptism, they claim they are **immersed** in the Spirit, and hence "baptism" means immersion in the mouth of John the Baptist and of Christ and of the Apostles.

"What a crooked web we weave,
When we practice first to deceive."

It is fair that I should allow Mr. Hulse

to speak for himself on the matter. So we quote:

"When John sought to emphasize the superiority of Christ's work over his he did so by contrasting the baptism which he was administering with that which Christ was to administer. He said: 'I indeed baptize you with water, . . . but he that cometh after me is mightier than I: . . . he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost' (Matt. 3: 11). Jesus came to administer a baptism which produces a real purification, and since baptism with water in his day was so universally understood to represent a purification, it is perfectly natural that he should adopt it as the sign of that inward purification of the heart which is wrought by baptism with the Holy Ghost."

We have already seen that the washings and bathings—the "water baptisms of the Law"—**did not** "represent a purification," as Mr. Hulse says, but were the acts by which the purifications were accomplished. And it would be so much more satisfactory to us all if our author had given us the Scripture which says that "water baptism stands as the sign of the purifying work of the Holy Spirit 'which is wrought by the baptism with the Holy Ghost.'" He cites us to the case in Acts 10 where it is recorded that "while Peter was yet speaking, the Holy Ghost fell upon them that heard," and claims this was a "baptism with the Holy Ghost." As an outstanding example of the author's perversion of a plain record to carry his point with the uninformed, I quote exactly: "In another place he (Peter) refers to the same incident, saying: 'And God . . . bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us, . . . **purifying their hearts,**'" (Acts 15: 8, 9).

Mr. Hulse so deceitfully handles this account as to make it teach that "God purified the hearts of the Gentiles by giving them the baptism with the Holy Ghost," and this in the face of the unequivocal declaration of the Holy Spirit in Acts 15: 9 that "God cleansed their hearts by **faith.**" What honest person can have any confidence in such an expositor of the Divine Record? If he will trifle with the Word of Jehovah in that

way, what will he not do with the testimony of men? The Gentiles at the house of Cornelius were **not** "baptized with the Holy Ghost": it was only the gift of tongues bestowed upon them, and it not to "purify their hearts" or to save them, but as proof to the six Jews that came with Peter that "God is no respecter of persons, but that in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to Him." This miracle was to these six Jews what the vision on the housetop was to Peter. I repeat, it was not a baptism in the Spirit, but the gift of tongues, "For they (of the circumcision) that believed were amazed, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles was poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit: for they heard them speak with tongues and magnify God." Persons who were baptized in the Holy Spirit could no more than "speak with tongues," as we shall now see.

There need be no guessing about what the baptism in the Holy Spirit was to do for those receiving it. The purpose of it is so plainly stated by Him who promised it, that there is absolutely no excuse for any one to ignore that purpose or those purposes and attach another one which the Lord does not mention. If we cannot find out from the Lord's promise of the baptism in the Spirit to the Apostles what it was to do for those receiving it, then there is no such thing as finding out. Just before His betrayal He said to the Apostles:

"I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth: whom the world cannot receive: for it beholdeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: ye know Him, for He abideth with you and shall be in you," (Jno. 14: 16, 17).

From this we learn that the Comforter or Holy Spirit (1) was to abide with them forever; (2) that "the world," those not converted to Christianity, "could not receive it." In the 26th verse of the same chapter Jesus repeats the promise thus: "But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said

unto you." From this we learn that the Spirit in baptismal measure was—

(1). To teach them (the Apostles) all things. People who now claim to be thus baptized know nothing more after their so-called Spirit baptism than they did before, of what Jesus said to these Apostles while He was with them—they cannot tell us a thing the Apostles did not tell.

(2) To "bring to their remembrance all things" He had said to them during the more than three years He was with them.

This same promise is repeated in John 15: 26 and 16: 7-13, as follows: "It is expedient for you (He was speaking to His Apostles) that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send him unto you. And he, when he is come, will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye behold me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged. I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth (the Comforter; the baptism in the Spirit) is come, he shall guide you into all the truth; for he shall not speak from himself; but what things so ever he shall hear, these shall be speak: and he shall show you things that are to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall take of mine and shall declare it unto you."

From this record of the promise of the baptism in the Spirit to the Apostles we learn that it was to—

(1) Bear witness of Christ by using the Apostles as speaking mediums.

(2) To convict the world in respect of sin.

(3) To convict the world in respect of righteousness.

(4) To convict the world in respect of judgment.

(5) To guide the Apostles into all the truth. (The truth they preached convicts the world in respect of sin, or righteousness and of judgment.)

(6) To reveal the future to them—"show you things to come"—make prophets of them.

(7) To glorify Jesus by exalting Him

as "the Head over all things to the Church," and giving Him the "pre-eminence in all things."

Among the things promised by the Lord that the Comforter should do for those receiving it, there is not one that it would "purify the heart of the sinner." To the contrary, Jesus plainly says of the Spirit baptism that "the world cannot receive it." Now why do people say the Holy Spirit shall do the very thing Jesus says he **shall not** do? Are they guided by the Holy Spirit when making such flat contradictions as that? Have Christ and the Spirit dissolved partnership and are now working **against** each other—each trying to discredit the other?

In Acts, chapter 2: 1-4, is the account of the fulfillment of these promises. As a result of being baptized in the Spirit, the Apostles "were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." These Apostles were already saved men. Of them Jesus had said, "Ye are clean (purified) through the words which I have spoken to you," (Jno. 15: 3). Jesus had ascended to heaven and offered His blood as an atonement for the sins of the world on the morning of His resurrection, fifty days before the Spirit came upon the Apostles; and when that was done, all whom John baptized and had remained true and faithful, were pardoned, blood-washed, forgiven, saved. So these Apostles were thus saved fifty days before they were baptized in the Holy Spirit. And if the Spirit did not come upon them to save them, how can any honest and sincere person conclude that sinners are to be saved by the baptism in the Spirit?

(Will have to devote a short article to his argument on Paul's statement that "Christ sent me not to baptize, etc.")

* * * *

A Methodist Tract On Baptism Reviewed Article V

We had hoped to end our review with the fourth article; but our author, Mr. T. L. Hulse, makes such a "grand stand play" on what Paul says to the Corinthians about Christ not sending him to baptize, but to preach the Gospel, that we could not do justice to his effulgences in

the fourth article. We have found him wrong on every important point he argued, and we find him very wrong on this matter also. After his weak effort to show that water baptism "is a sign of the work which the Holy Spirit performs in us," he says:

"From the foregoing it will be seen that baptism is not a saving ordinance. It is only the sign of that which saves. Then can we be saved (forgiven) without first submitting to water baptism? Paul thought so. Hear him in I Corinthians 1: 14-17: 'I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius, . . . and I baptized also the household of Stephanas . . . For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel.' Now, if baptism is necessary to salvation, is it not strange that Paul did so little of it? And is it not stranger still that he should rejoice in the meagerness of his soul-saving work? On this question Paul stood just where the Methodist Church stands today. He considered it an important but not a vital matter."

The premises from which he draws this conclusion are supposed by him to be found laid and fortified in the part of the tract we have reviewed. But in fact he has no foundation or premises there—they have all been swept away in the flood of Truth. He writes about what Paul said to the Corinthians as if Paul had quite a time of it to keep the Corinthians from wanting to be baptized, and as if it was very wrong for them to be baptized; for he has Paul thanking God that he had yielded to their demands and baptized only a few of them! And to justify himself for not baptizing any more of them Paul says "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." As if Paul realized that he had baptized the few at Corinth without any authority from Christ whatever to do so! Hulse thus changes the meaning and use of Paul's language by leaving off the reason Paul himself gives for thanking God that he had baptized but few of them. Paul says the Corinthian brethren had "all been baptized into one body"—that they had all been of "one spirit" when they were baptized, (Ch. 12: 13), and a little farther on says that "one body" is the

church, (Col. 1: 18). But he found them divided up into Paulite, Apollosite and Cephasite denominations, and some, like the so-called "Campbellites" of our day, stood for Christ alone, and Paul knew that for them to be entitled to wear his name as a religious designation, they would have to be "baptized into his name." They were declaring they were baptized into the name of Paul when they called themselves by his name. He therefore "thanked God" that he had "baptized only the few he names and assigns as a reason, 'Lest any man should say that ye were baptized into my name.'" His reason for thanks was not that "baptism is not a saving ordinance," an empty ceremony that people can submit to or not, just as suits their whims; but that by submitting to it one comes "into some one's name," such as Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist, Paulite, Cephasite or Apollosite, or even the name of Christ—Christian. He teaches the Corinthians that they were doing very wrong in perverting the purpose of a Divine institution into an empty ceremony of getting into such denominational names as Paulite, Cephasite, etc.

The fact that Paul "was sent to preach the gospel" shows that his commission is greatly different from the commission and mission of Methodist preachers and other baby sprinklers. Imagine, if you can, Mr. Hulse gathering a lot of little babies together and preaching the gospel to them as they lay in their mothers' arms or in their cradles! How the little dears, only eight days or a few weeks old, would weep with joy and sing praises when he would tell them that Jesus came into the world to save all of them from sin—that He was crucified, buried and raised from the dead for their justification from the Adamic or "original sin"! Then after he preaches the gospel to them until they acknowledge Jesus to be the Christ, he sprinkles a little water on the head of each and calls it baptism: Would that not be a scene to cause angels to rejoice?! But Mr. Hulse would say that he does not preach to babies; but according to Methodist doctrine he "baptizes" those he does not preach the gospel to, if we call sprinkling baptism.

So did not Paul. The commission under which the Apostles worked reads:

"Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," (Matt. 28: 19, 20). And, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned," (Mk. 16: 15, 16). Mr. Hulse says 'baptism is not a saving ordinance,' and, if he is true to Methodist doctrine, as he seems to be, he will go to the cradle and sprinkle water on the head of a two weeks old infant, call that performance baptism, and say the baby was saved by it! If it was saved then, it was by water only, and a very precious little bit of water at that! When are we to believe Methodist preachers, anyhow?

But our author thinks he has a "clinch-er" in the following: "If we would know just what Paul was sent to do, let us turn to Acts 26: 16-19. Here he receives his commission from his glorified Lord. (And we will remark here that it is one that does not send him to babies.) In this commission are these particulars: "Delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom I now send thee. To open their eyes and to turn them from darkness to light (Like Mr. Hulse does the babies? Huh?) and from the power of Satan unto God, **that they may receive the forgiveness of sins**, and inheritance among them which are sanctified." Would this send Paul after the little babies to sprinkle water on them?

Mr. H. concludes from Paul's commission that "Therefore men **may receive forgiveness of sins without water baptism.**" He cannot see that "turning them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God" can possibly include "baptism for the remission of sins," Paul himself was thus "turned," but not without some wonderful facts first planted in his mind and being told by the preacher the Lord sent to him, "Why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on His name," (Ac. 22: 16). And the Holy

Spirit says through Peter, "Baptism doth also now save us," (I Pet. 3: 21). Mr. H. says it does not save, for "it is not a saving ordinance!"

Let us briefly consider Acts 2: 37, 38 and 3: 19. The first is what the Spirit said through the Apostles to the thousands on Pentecost: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name (by the authority) of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." The other is the same Spirit's answer a few days later to the multitude at Solomon's porch: "Repent ye therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord." Notice that "be baptized" follows "repent" in the first; and "turn again" follows it in the second, while "remission of sins" follows "baptized" in the first, and "turn again" in the second. Surely the Holy Spirit would not forget what he told the thousands on Pentecost to do to be saved in just a few days and give directions in the same city that mean something altogether different. Only a few days before this about three thousand people had repented and been baptized unto the remission of their sins, and surely the people present at Solomon's porch knew of it and would understand the Spirit's directions to mean the same thing on each occasion. The directions to "turn again" must mean the same thing therefore as "be baptized." As Paul was guided by the same Holy Spirit in his work of "turning people from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God that they may receive remission of sins," that Spirit would not miss the turning point—would not leave out "baptism unto the remission of sins." So Hulse is inexcusably wrong again.

His last effort to show that baptism has "modes" and that pouring is the "mode," is to quote the prophecy, "In the last days saith God, I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." Well, if pouring is baptism, then that which is poured is baptized, not that on which the element falls. If it is water that is poured, then it is water that is baptized, if pouring is baptism. So our author's proof from this

prophecy fails him.

As a last effort he refers to Peter's language that "Baptism is the answer of a good conscience "toward God," and explains that this means whatever satisfies the conscience of the candidate is baptism. If you have been taught that sprinkling is baptism, then only sprinkling will satisfy your conscience. If you have been taught that pouring is baptism, then nothing but pouring will satisfy your conscience. So with immersion. How accommodating the Holy Spirit has been on this matter! He leaves each one to determine what he will submit to, and thus each obeys himself instead of the Lord! Affusionist exegetes, as well as all those who have been taught that the feelings they experience under religious excitement, is "God speaking their sins forgiven," and who, consequently, are compelled to extract all important significance from baptism, never look under the surface in the matter of baptism being the "answer of a good conscience toward God." The Greek for "answer" is *eperootema*, and is defined as meaning "to request, to seek after." Then in being baptized the one submitting to it is "requesting, seeking after" a good conscience or a forgiven state. This makes it agree with "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (pardoned); and the Spirit's answer, "Repent and be baptized . . . unto the remission of your sins," and with what Ananias said to Saul, "Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins," and with Peter's statement that "Baptism doth also now save us." There is hardly anything right about Mr. Hulse's tract.

* * * *

A Methodist Tract On Baptism Reviewed. Something On The Constructive Side

Article VI

It was not our original intention to put the foregoing five articles in review of the Methodist tract on Baptism in tract form; but, encouraged by suggestions and requests to do so, I decided to add the following matter on the positive or constructive side of the question, and have the whole preserved in tract form at such a low price that brethren can pur-

chase them by the dozen or hundred and distribute them among their friends.

* * *

Baptism: What Is It And Why?

Jesus said, "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God" (John 3: 5); and, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16: 15, 16); and the Apostle Peter "commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 10: 48). The same Spirit-guided apostle says, "Baptism doth also now save us" (I Peter 3: 21); and Paul says, "As many of you as were baptized into Christ did put him on" (Gal. 3: 27). It is not an empty ceremony, then; but is on the dividing line between out of Christ, and "in Christ." But,

What is Baptism?

From the New Testament references to it we find the following unerring points: It requires,

1. Water—Acts 10: 47, 48.
2. Much water—John 3: 23.
3. Going down into the water—Acts 8: 38.
4. Handling the candidate—Acts 8: 38; Matt. 28: 19.
5. A birth of water—John 3: 5.
6. A burial—Rom. 6: 3; Col. 2: 12.
7. A form of planting—Rom. 6: 5.
8. It is a washing of the body—Heb. 10: 22; Titus 3: 5.
9. A form of resurrection—Rom. 6: 5; Col. 2: 12, 13.
10. Coming up out of the water—Mark 1: 10; Acts 8: 39.

But some say that "smart men say that sprinkling and pouring are also baptism." There are "smart men," but none of them are as "smart" as the Lord Jesus Christ, who is the King and Judge, and in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge (Col. 2: 3). Are we showing ourselves loyal to Jesus when we set His laws or word aside and substitute our own? Neither sprinkling nor pouring will fit in either of the above scriptures. Try them.

New Testament Sprinkling

1. Hebrews 10: 22—"On the hearts."
2. Hebrews 9: 13—Blood and ashes.
3. Hebrews 9: 19—Blood.

4. Hebrews 9: 21—Blood.
 5. Hebrews 11: 28—Blood.
 6. Hebrews 12: 24—Blood.
 7. I Peter 1: 2—Blood of Christ
- New Testament and Pouring**
1. Matthew 26: 12—Ointment.
 2. John 2: 15—Money poured out.
 3. John 13: 5—Water poured into a basin.
 4. Luke 10: 34—Oil and wine.
 5. Acts 2: 17, 18—Holy Spirit.
 6. Revelation 14: 10—The wrath of God.
 7. Revelation 16: 1-8—The wrath of God.

We surely can see that while the New Testament mentions sprinkling and pouring, they have no reference whatever to baptism.

Blessings of Scriptural Baptism

Some say "it makes no difference whether one is sprinkled, poured or immersed, for it is only a form anyhow." Do you think it makes "no difference" whether people obey the Lord or not? Look at II Thess. 1: 7-9 and Matt. 15: 8, 9 and decide for yourself whether it "makes no difference." In the following scriptures the Lord and the Holy Spirit say that baptism means something:

1. Ephesians 5: 26—Cleansed by.
2. Matthew 28: 19—Initiates into the Divine names.
3. Gal. 3: 27—Initiates into Christ.
4. Acts 2: 38—Is "unto remission of sins."
5. John 3: 5—Initiates into the Kingdom of Heaven, or is the final act of the new birth.
6. I Cor. 12: 13—Initiates into the "one Body."
7. Acts 19: 5—Is done by the authority of Jesus.
8. I Peter 1: 21—Saved by baptism.
9. I Peter 1: 21—The seeking for a good conscience.
10. Acts 8: 38, 39—A source of joy.
11. Acts 22: 16—Washes away sins.
12. Romans 6: 4—Inducts into the new life.
13. Romans 6: 5—By it we are "united with Christ."
14. Col. 3: 1—Seeking things above follow it.

Jesus told John that He (Jesus) must

be baptized to fulfill all the demands of the Father, and God did not openly acknowledge Jesus as His Son until He was baptized. The Father then said He was "well pleased with" Jesus' action. "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter "Fear God and keep His commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God will bring every work into judgment, with every hidden thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil" (Eccl. 12: 13, 14). "Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have the right to come to the tree of life, and may enter in by the gates into the city" (Rev. 22: 14).

The Four Baptisms of the New Testament

I. The FIRST one in point of Time is A Command Before the Cross.

- (1) The **Administrator** of it was John.—Matt. 3: 6; Mark 1: 5, 6; Luke 3: 16; John 1: 26, 33; Acts 1: 5.
- (2) The **Element** used was water.—Matt. 3: 6, 11, 16; Mark 1: 5-10; Luke 3: 16; John 1: 33; Acts 1: 5.
- (3) The **Subjects, Believing Jews**.—Matt. 3: 2, 7; 10: 5-7.
- (4) Design or Purpose of it—"To make ready for the Lord a people prepared for Him"—Luke 1: 17, 76; Isa. 40: 3; Matt. 3: 3.

II. The SECOND in point of Time was a Promise Fulfilled at Pentecost, A.D. 30.

- (1) **Administrator—Christ**.—Matt. 3: 11; Mark 1: 6; Luke 3: 16; John 1: 33.
- (2) **Element** to be used—the **Holy Spirit**.—Matt. 3: 11; Mark 1: 8; Luke 3: 16; John 1: 32, 33; 14: 16, 17, 26; 16: 7, 15; Acts 1: 5, 8.
- (3) **Subjects** of it, the **Apostles**.—John 14: 16, 17; 15: 26; 16: 7-15; Acts 1: 5, 8; Acts 2: 1-4.
- (4) The **Design or Purpose** of it was to **INSPIRE** the Apostles.—John 14: 16, 17; 15: 26; 16: 7-15; Acts 1: 8; 2: 4.

III. The THIRD as a **COMMAND** to **ALL**

NATIONS.

- (1) **The Administrator—Any Gospel Preacher.**—Matt. 28: 20; Mark 16: 15, 16; Acts 8: 38.
- (2) **The Element used—WATER.**—Acts 8: 38; 10: 48. (They could not use the Holy Spirit, for Jesus reserved that to Himself).—Matt. 3: 11; Mark 1: 8; Luke 3: 16.
- (3) **Subjects of this Baptism, Penitent Believers.**—Matt. 29: 19, 20; Mark 16: 15, 16; Acts 2: 38, 41; Acts 8: 12, 12, 13, 34-38; 16: 31-34; 18: 8; 19: 5; 22: 14-16.
- (4) **Design or Purpose: REMISSION OF SINS.**—Mark 16: 15, 16; John 3: 5; Acts 2: 38; 22: 16; Rom. 6: 3, 4; Rom. 6: 17, 18; Gal. 3: 27; Col. 2: 12; Eph. 5: 26; I Cor. 12: 13; Titus 3: 5; I Peter 3: 21.

IV. A Threat to be Executed at Judgment.

- (1) **Administrator**—Christ.—Matt. 3: 11; Mark 1: 8; Luke 3: 16; Matt. 25: 41-46.
- (2) **Element used—FIRE**—Matt. 3: 11; 25: 41-46; Luke 3: 16.
- (3) **Subjects, the Disobedient and Unbelieving.**—Mark 16: 16; Rom. 2: 5-9; II Thess. 1: 8.
- (4) **Design or Purpose—to PUNISH.**—Matt. 25: 41-46; II Thess. 1: 8, 9; Rom. 2: 5-9.

While this first baptism was an immersion "for the remission of sins," persons were qualified for it by "believing in a Messiah yet to come" (Acts 19: 4), and it would do no one any good in the sight of the Lord to submit to it now. The twelve mentioned in Acts 19: 1-7 had been baptized "unto" this baptism a number of years after Jesus had come; hence Paul taught them aright and "baptized

them in the name of the Lord Jesus."

The second of these four, while people may want it, it was for only the Apostles and was to "bring all things to their remembrance that Jesus had said to them" during His three and one-half years' personal sojourn with them, and was not designed to save them, for they were already saved men when it came upon them.

The third one is for "all nations" and "every creature" that can believe in Christ, and it is "unto the remission of sins," to "wash away sins" (Acts 22: 16 and I Peter 3: 21); but strange to say, but few people want it. They want the one they can not get and which would not save them if they could get it, and reject the one intended for them and which they can get and by which they can be saved! There is nothing more contrary and stubborn than human nature.

The fourth one is not wanted by any sensible person, but it is one that multitudes are going to get—all the unbelieving and disobedient—those "that know not God and obey not the Gospel" or "receive not the love of the truth that they may be saved." Better obey the Lord in the one you can than to get one (the first) that will do you no good, or to pray for one (the second) you can not get, or to finally get one (the fourth) that you do not want. Place yourself in that great audience on Pentecost at Jerusalem and imagine yourself as asking with many others, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Then hear the answer the Holy Spirit brought to the memory of the Apostles to give, which is, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2: 37, 38).

* * * *

